

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

V.

NO. 3:19-CR-11-1

BRANDON LAWRENCE

ORDER

On September 16, 2020, this Court sentenced Brandon Lawrence to 292 months imprisonment on Counts One and Three of the Indictment, to be served concurrently.¹ Doc. #391. On or about February 10, 2021, Lawrence filed a motion requesting “copies of the Transcripts of his Plea Colloquy and Sentencing Hearings.” Doc. #584. Lawrence represents that “[t]hese documents are needed in order to be able to properly file a pleading … under the provisions of 18 U.S.C. § 2255” and argues that, because he “was pursuant to forma pauperis appointed Counsel for his defense [and] [h]is indigence status has not changed,” “the fee for the production of these transcripts should be waived due to his indigence status.” *Id.* at 1.

Though Lawrence was appointed counsel on March 28, 2019, after then demonstrating his financial eligibility for such appointment, *see* Doc. #43, he has not established his current financial status.² And to the extent he seeks the transcripts to support the claim in his later-filed § 2255 motion that his attorney failed to comply with his request to file an appeal, *see* Doc. #643, Lawrence does not explain, and the Court does not see, how the transcripts of his plea and sentencing hearings would bear on the attorney-client privileged communications at issue in his § 2255 motion. Accordingly, not only is the Court unable to conclude that Lawrence is currently

¹ Lawrence and thirteen others were charged in a 17-count indictment with various crimes related to a drug trafficking conspiracy. Doc. #1. Following Lawrence’s guilty plea to Counts One and Three, the remaining counts naming him were dismissed. Doc. #391 at 1.

² See generally 28 U.S.C. § 1915.

financially unable to pay transcript costs, Lawrence has not demonstrated how the transcripts are essential to his § 2255 motion.³ *See United States v. Davis*, 369 F. App'x 546, 547 (5th Cir. 2010) (prisoner was not entitled to transcripts where he failed to “explain why the requested transcripts were necessary to decide” issues in his § 2255 motion). For these reasons, Lawrence’s motion for transcripts [584] is **DENIED**.

SO ORDERED, this 13th day of October, 2021.

/s/Debra M. Brown
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

³ Lawrence has also failed to submit the proper transcript request form.